



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/090,685	03/05/2002	Alfred Thomas	07-2176-A	8496
20306	7590	03/12/2008	EXAMINER	
MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP			MENDIRATTA, VISHU K	
300 S. WACKER DRIVE				
32ND FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, IL 60606			3711	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/12/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1                   RECORD OF ORAL HEARING  
2

3                   UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
4

---

5

6                   BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
7                   AND INTERFERENCES  
8

---

9

10                  Ex parte ALFRED THOMAS, DUNCAN F. BROWN,  
11                  LAWRENCE E. DEMAR and SCOTT D. SLOMIANY  
12

---

13

14                  Appeal 2007-2444  
15                  Application 10/090,685  
16                  Technology Center 3700  
17

---

18

19                  Oral Hearing Held: February 20, 2008  
20

---

21

22

23

24                  Before HUBERT C. LORIN, ANTON W. FETTING, and JOSEPH A.  
25                  FISCHETTI, Administrative Patent Judges  
26

27                  ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:  
28

29                  MICHAEL BANIAK, ATTORNEY  
30                  McDonnell, Boehnen, Hulbert & Berghoff, L.L.P.  
31                  300 S. Wacker Drive  
32                  32<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
33                  Chicago, IL 60606  
34

35

36                  The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Wednesday, February 20,  
37                  2008, at The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street,  
38                  Alexandria, Virginia, before Virginia Johnson, Freestate Reporting, Inc.

1

2                   P R O C E E D I N G S

3

4                 MS. HALL: This is Calendar Number 38, Appeal Number 2007-  
5         2444. Attorney is Mr. Michael Baniak.

6                 JUDGE LORIN: Thank you. Good morning, Counsel.

7                 MR. BANIAK: Good morning.

8                 JUDGE LORIN: You're Mr. Michael Baniak, B A N I A K.

9                 MR. BANIAK: That's right. That's my best, my best printing too.

10                JUDGE LORIN: Alright, Counsel, this is Appeal Number 2007-  
11         2444. We have read your briefs and are familiar with the issues. You have  
12         20 minutes when you're ready, you may proceed.

13                MR. BANIAK: Thank you. Michael Baniak on behalf of the  
14         Applicants Alfred, DeMar et al. Let's talk about what the invention is.

15                JUDGE FETTING: Can you speak up a little bit?

16                MR. BANIAK: Yeah.

17                JUDGE FETTING: I'm having a little trouble hearing you.

18                MR. BANIAK: Let's talk about what the invention is and what the  
19         prior art isn't. What we're dealing with here is a game, variously claimed as  
20         a method, variously claimed as a gaming machine. And, it is based on a, a  
21         fairly well known game called Keno. And, I don't know how many of you  
22         get to casinos. I get there every now and then.

23                But, Keno is a game whereby you have a matrix with numbers on it  
24         and the player selects various of those numbers. And, then the machine  
25         proceeds to generate some random selection of its own numbers, and then  
26         there's a match-up or not. And, depending on how many match up, based on

1 what the machine has selected then there's an outcome. Part of the  
2 attraction to a user, to a player of Keno is there's this aspect of I have a  
3 choice. I have a selection. I just don't flip a coin and pull a lever and then  
4 things happen. I actually choose the spots where and choose the numbers  
5 where I am, you know, at least having some input as to how the game is  
6 progressing.

7 That's why Keno has its own place and why it's got own following.  
8 There's also a game that we're all very familiar with that I just made  
9 reference to which is a slot machine, whereby reels spin and then outcomes  
10 are determined depending on how those reels may match up. This game is a  
11 combination of spinning reels and Keno; hence the name Spin Keno.

12 What our client -- my client has done -- the Applicants have done is  
13 put something together which has this element of selection associated with  
14 it. And, allows the user now to pick spots according to what the user wants;  
15 what the user's wager is. But, instead of those numbers matching up,  
16 instead of the machine telling you how, you know, selection is going to be,  
17 each one of those reels then spins, and it's a reel mechanism. In sense R E E  
18 L. Those spin in each instance; every time to play the game. That's the  
19 game play condition. And, then the outcome, the payout is determined on  
20 how those elements match up. If you get three cherries, so located on the  
21 board, then you win. Two cherries, no you don't win.

22 So, that's how this game, as claimed, and that -- and what I just  
23 described is in all the claims. How this game is played and how this game is  
24 claimed. What we don't have in the prior art, for example --

25 JUDGE LORIN: Counsel, let me stop you for a second.

26 MR. BANIAK: Sure.

1           JUDGE LORIN: I want to understand this game a little better than  
2 you're inventing. You say it's not a Keno, but you -- the claim requires you  
3 to select, select your spots, just like Keno, and then, and then other numbers  
4 or other indicia are being randomly picked to compare with the one that's  
5 been selected --

6           MR. BANIAK: No.

7           JUDGE LORIN: -- which Keno also does?

8           MR. BANIAK: No. What you end up with is you -- imagine you're  
9 looking at a reel on a slot machine. Okay, the slot machine only has a  
10 certain number of indicia that are going to show up; ten or whatever, you  
11 know, plum, cherry, lemon, etcetera. Okay, the spots that you've selected in  
12 the claimed game -- those spots, each one of those is going to choose from  
13 that, that set of indicia and just that set of indicia. So --

14          JUDGE LORIN: If you, if you have a reel and you pick the cherry,  
15 then the reel will move until something else comes up. If it comes up a  
16 cherry, then it's, then you've matched it.

17          MR. BANIAK: Every time you go, every time you play this game,  
18 as claimed, you end up with, you know, picking, you know, various spots  
19 that you decide that's not -- I think that's my lucky one, that's my lucky  
20 spot, and you pick those and then it is randomly going to generate. It's  
21 going to spin and randomly generate something; a plum, a cherry, whatever.  
22 And then, you look to see how those match up.

23          JUDGE LORIN: Oh --

24          MR. BANIAK: It's the matching relationship of those. So, it's the  
25 randomness associated with the indicia that are being applied in each  
26 instance. There's the difference between Keno because Keno you just pick,

1 you know, 45. You pick 30.

2 JUDGE LORIN: And, that indicia remains --

3 MR. BANIAK: That stays there.

4 JUDGE LORIN: -- while the other ones move and what you're  
5 saying is your indicia actually moves as well.

6 MR. BANIAK: Every time, every time.

7 JUDGE LORIN: Okay.

8 MR. BANIAK: So, it's changed. So, there's the combination of a  
9 spinning reel in a slot machine, and the Keno game. The Keno game, in  
10 essence, just I have the ability to pick where these are, then I'm going to see  
11 how things match-up afterwards. So, it's a very, it's a, it's a very different  
12 game from Keno. It's a very different thing from a slot machine. So, we go  
13 to, for example, take a look at Tarantino. The Examiner has given me a 102  
14 rejection, anticipation on the basis of Tarantino.

15 We look at the Tarantino reference and just, for example, we go to,  
16 you know, Claim 47. Just pick that one for purposes of a discussion today.  
17 First we have a spinning reel. Look at Tarantino. Tarantino is a dice game  
18 and the embodiment has specifically disclosed there, but let's move passed  
19 the fact that, you know, we're dealing with a reel here. We look at the  
20 limitations in my Claim 47 and I think that is strategic here when we  
21 consider the Examiner's basis for his rejection. Look at the words. We've  
22 chose these words very carefully, as a patent practitioner. I write these  
23 words for the invention specifically. If I call it a reel, it's a reel. It's not  
24 something else. If I say I have a control input, as in this claim, there's a  
25 control input. Okay, very important language.

26 The user is exercising some control. I'm not dropping a coin in.

1 That's a separate element of the claim. The wager input. I put a wager in,  
2 fine. Things may happen as a result of that wager, but I have a control input  
3 that's separate from that wager input. Now, I register -- registering a  
4 selection input by a player of selected reels. A very important strategic  
5 limitation in these claims which is not anything you find in Tarantino. It's  
6 not anything in the other reference, Simunek, on which Claim 47 is also  
7 rejected as supposedly anticipated. Because I'm selecting, I'm selecting  
8 particular reels in which to spin. I'm selecting less than all of the reels. I'm  
9 not taking the entire board. I'm selecting less than all. Again, the user is --  
10 the player is supplying input to the invention. That's the control input. That  
11 word has meaning. Less than all the reels are selected. Then, after  
12 registering that selection, and then the wager input, then I spin all of the  
13 reels, okay. At least all of the selected reels. Maybe there are other ones  
14 spinning, I don't care. My limitation is I, I at least spin all of the selected  
15 reels; not just some. That's my game play condition, and then I have a pay  
16 out as a result of that game play condition.

17 There's no control input in Tarantino. Nothing. The user just puts a  
18 wager in, and that wager determines, for example, a column that's now  
19 going to be activated.

20 JUDGE FISCHETTI: I guess I -- I'm trying -- I see where it says an  
21 input mechanism through which your player provides a control and input,  
22 but I don't see where the claim indicates what that control is over. I mean,  
23 putting a coin in the slot certainly controls the, the, the subsequent  
24 functioning of the game.

25 MR. BANIAK: Correct, go down to said operating system. The  
26 control input is then tied into registering a selection input by a player of

1 selected reels. Control selection. Active verbs. The user is doing  
2 something. The user is doing a selection. Whereas in Tarantino, there is no  
3 such selection. All the user does is say I put one coin in, I get a column.  
4 Now, if I succeed, because Tarantino is a building operation -- if I succeed  
5 on that first coin, Tarantino says then put in another coin and now you can  
6 advance and I'll give you two columns for that. No selection. I get two  
7 more columns, and they're the next two columns. And, then if I succeed so  
8 far I put another third coin and then maybe I get some more columns. It's a  
9 building operation. It's a seriatim game. Very different from what we're  
10 talking about in terms of these claims which are spun all at once based on  
11 the selections that you've made.

12 So, it's not an anticipation, nor do you see that it's rendering our  
13 claims in any way obvious as a result thereof. Not that there's an obvious  
14 rejection on this particular claim based on Tarantino, but just look at the  
15 invention and the context of, for example, of Simunek, the other supposedly  
16 102 piece of prior art.

17 The Examiner has looked at Simunek and essentially said I see, I see  
18 reels in that disclosure. I see reels that replace, replace selected items in a  
19 Keno game, and so I see that I can take those reels and what I'm going to do  
20 is, says the Examiner, is I'm going to interpret -- we have a creative  
21 interpretation here, which I don't think is fair, of Simunek. And, what I'm  
22 going to say is although Simunek tells us that those reels may appear and  
23 those reels go in the place of matched indicia as in a standard Keno game,  
24 I'm going to imagine a scenario where all of those particular elements, those  
25 particular numbers that have matched -- I'm going to imagine all of those  
26 happen to also match up with what the machine has generated.

1        So, in this particular, I would say magical situation, I picked ten spots,  
2    alright. That's what I've done in Simunek. I've picked ten, and all ten  
3    happen to match up. Now, I have reels replacing all of those ten, and then  
4    those reels spin and a bonus scenario results. Alright, I don't think you can  
5    do that. I don't think that is how that all works. I think you have to read the  
6    disclosure for what it discloses, not what you imagine it might disclose.

7        You know, to me this is akin to that phrase where -- that, that analogy  
8    where I had ten monkeys pounding on a typewriter for millions of years, I'm  
9    going to get Romeo and Juliet. You can't do that with a disclosure such as  
10   this. I think that's just what the Examiner is doing. Imagine a scenario like  
11   that, then it would anticipate. It just doesn't work the same way. And, it  
12   doesn't yield the game that's the same as our particular game because in  
13   order to do what Simunek is talking about you have to have another step in  
14   the process.

15       We have spinning reels. Each one spins every time. Now, in  
16   Simunek that's not the situation. Because what happens in Simunek is you  
17   have to pick those spots in the standard Keno game and the machine then  
18   generates something, alright. And, as to those matches, Simunek says, in a  
19   certain embodiment I'll replace some of those matches with reels, but the  
20   machine is entered is, is a randomness associated with that. And, as I started  
21   out here, the whole idea is that the user, the player, has that selective ability.  
22   The user is going to say I want a reel there and I want to spin that reel and  
23   something is going to happen with that reel. Not say -- not so with Simunek.  
24   There's a random element generated in that, and that can be a massive  
25   difference. A huge difference between a game that you want to play if you  
26   go to a casino and a game that would be a total dog, because we don't see

1 any games such as what we see here Simunek out there. It's just not a game  
2 that anybody would really want to play.

3 And, this is all about entertainment. It's all about getting users to play  
4 the game because if they don't then there really is no point in creating a  
5 game like this that nobody wants to play. The Examiner has essentially  
6 treated Simunek, I think, as a nose of wax which many of us use that --  
7 throw that term around in patent lexicon. But, that is a twisting a tourniquet  
8 to try to make it into something that it really isn't. He's done the same thing  
9 with Tarantino; taking that reference molding into something that it doesn't,  
10 doesn't do. And, then on the obviousness aspect of the rejection as to those  
11 certain claims, I don't see the Examiner putting these pieces together.  
12 Somehow, someway in a manner that, you know, there's a teaching. There's  
13 a motivation to do that. He basically just says this is a game. These are  
14 games you can put them together, and there now I've got it. I've sort of  
15 taken the game of monopoly and I've taken all those pieces and I've thrown  
16 them into a box and now I take those pieces and I can put them together  
17 somehow, someway and ignore the rules of each of those games, which are  
18 entirely disparate.

19 The way that Tarantino was done and the way that Simunek is done;  
20 very, very different games. They don't mesh and you can't take out of the  
21 box and say, alright, I'm going to take those pieces and put them together  
22 because I can find some or all of what's in your game and ignore the rules,  
23 ignore what the teaching of Simunek is. Ignore what the teaching of  
24 Tarantino is. And, then paste them together and say now I've got your game  
25 because I can find those pieces in the art and ignore what the references  
26 actually teach.

1           JUDGE LORIN: I have a question, a procedural one. I was going  
2 through the record when I noticed the Examiner had applied a rejection of  
3 Claims 37 to 38 and 44 to 46 under 103.

4           MR. BANIAK: Correct.

5           JUDGE LORIN: And, then when you filed the Appeal Brief, you  
6 must have missed -- misunderstood and then responded to a rejection  
7 involving Claims 25, 29, 39, 47 and 50.

8           MR. BANIAK: If you follow through the record here, sometimes  
9 the, the rejections were not all that clear and all of the, you know, to me --

10          JUDGE LORIN: But these, but these rejections 37, 38, 44, 46, they  
11 were in the final rejection.

12          MR. BANIAK: That's correct. Those are the only ones --

13          JUDGE LORIN: And, they were in the answer as well.

14          MR. BANIAK: Those were the only ones that the Examiner said  
15 specifically a 103. What I did was, was I wanted to deal with the underlying  
16 base claims in addition to that. So, I dealt with those on the off chance that's  
17 what the Examiner also intended because we tried to talk to the Examiner on  
18 an interview with the Examiner because I really felt that the Examiner was  
19 totally missing, you know, not only our invention, but misinterpreting the  
20 prior art, but I never got the opportunity. The Examiner did not want to have  
21 an interview. So, I was perhaps reading more into that rejection on 103  
22 basis, but there is no 103 basis beyond what you just articulated, Judge  
23 Lorin.

24          JUDGE LORIN: Yeah, because I, I noticed then that in the Reply  
25 Brief you present all these arguments that are on point with regard to those  
26 claims.

1           MR. BANIAK: Correct.

2           JUDGE LORIN: Was there any response from the Examiner to those  
3 arguments.

4           MR. BANIAK: No, because there was no additional brief that was  
5 filed. The Examiner just said, you know, that's moot. And, I believe, what  
6 he meant to say and said, you know, there's record of this. I believe what he  
7 meant to say is was no record of any such 103 applied to the underlying  
8 basis --

9           JUDGE LORIN: No, no that was in response to your, to your brief.

10          MR. BANIAK: Correct.

11          JUDGE LORIN: But, I'm asking whether there, there was any  
12 response to your Reply Brief.

13          MR. BANIAK: No, Sir, not that I'm aware of. I didn't see anything  
14 in the file. Nothing like that. So, you know, maybe I was exercising some  
15 overkill in regard to arguing, you know, no obviousness rejection with  
16 respect to the underlying claims let alone, you know, what's in the  
17 dependent claims that the Examiner specifically rejected on 103 grounds.

18          JUDGE LORIN: But the limitations in those specific claims were  
19 first argued in the Reply Brief.

20          MR. BANIAK: I don't believe so. I think we dealt with that in the  
21 Opening Brief and the Examiner responded, you know, and then what I did  
22 was discuss the underlying claims as not being obvious as well as not being  
23 anticipated. Am I, am I answering the question or am I missing something?

24          JUDGE LORIN: No, I'm just reading, I was reading the record and I  
25 noticed in the Reply Brief was the first time we see arguments with respect  
26 to the specific limitations in the claims that were originally rejected.

1           MR. BANIAK: Right, I dealt with --

2           JUDGE LORIN: And, and I was simply asking whether the  
3 Examiner ever responded to those arguments you had made.

4           MR. BANIAK: I don't think there's any served reply in there. The  
5 Examiner basically said, you know, you're arguing obviousness --

6           JUDGE LORIN: Um-hum.

7           MR. BANIAK: -- and, I believe your argument is moot because I  
8 never rejected on the basis of obviousness.

9           JUDGE LORIN: Well, no, the Examiner is saying that those weren't  
10 the claims that were being rejected.

11          MR. BANIAK: Right, right. I'm sorry, you're correct. The  
12 additional claims that I put in there were not rejected on the basis of  
13 obviousness.

14          JUDGE LORIN: Right.

15          MR. BANIAK: Just those four dependent claims that you articulated.

16          JUDGE LORIN: Correct.

17          JUDGE LORIN: Any questions? Well, Counsel, there's no more  
18 questions. Thank you, very much.

19          MR. BANIAK: Thank you.

20          JUDGE LORIN: And, we'll take your comments under advisement.  
21          (Whereupon, the proceedings concluded.)